

Omaha. They include Senator Will's nephew, Andrew Hotz, and their teachers. Would you please rise and be recognized. Welcome to the Chamber. Thank you. Senator Moore, you're next.

SENATOR MOORE: Thank you, Madam President and members. I'd like to first talk a little bit...I know Senator Withem had talked about his frustrations and he's been consistent in his concern over the years and I respect that. But the one thing people...I would like people to understand is that LB 839 doesn't...\$17,000 a year is all it's worth and it's not going to balance the budget. But unless you pass LB 839, you can't save that \$17,000. That's the problem. I mean you have the statutory prohibition. The only way you can save that \$17,000 is somehow changing the statute. There's a couple of ways you can do that and one is to use the method of picking one bill in the Appropriations Committee, gutting it, putting all those changes in one bill, send them out on the floor never having a hearing or anything, that's been done in the past and that's been criticized in the past. And I understand that. My preferred method of doing it is to be more up front and open about it and saying let's introduce these bills, give them a number, give them a one-line, let people look at them, attack them, dissect them, and then make a policy decision on them. I mean and that's the preferred way of doing it; but when you do it that way, you raise concerns about (1) introducing a bill late, (2) you'd have the bait out there anyway, but you'd certainly have a higher probability of people saying, hum. They read the one-liner on that and they can say, well, that's an easy amendment, let's start amending it. And that was my concern all the way through as it was in LB 838. You know, the body, if you remember originally in February the Appropriations Committee had a list of 20-some odd bills that if you wanted to change the appropriation it was contingent upon some statutory change. And instead of introducing 20-some bills, we waited until the entire package was done, we introduced 8; 1 was withdrawn; 1 failed to get out of I believe the Judiciary Committee; the other 6 advanced and we've discussed and I thank the body for working with that. There's not a set process on how to do that, and I would welcome a better way to do that. But the way we're doing it now I think is given the...I think is the cleanest way of doing it and gives people the most up front and out in the open way of doing it. But I mean there's concerns there, too, and I'm willing to explore another way of doing it. But given the way we are doing it, as I said in LB 838, my concern is that when you start opening up...I mean